CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.620
25 May 1992

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 14 May 1992, at 10 a.m

President: Mr. Abdelhamid SEMICHI (Algeria)

GE.92-61466/4520B

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I declare open the 620th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

First of all, on behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf I would like to bid a warm welcome to the new representatives of Japan and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ambassadors Yoshitomo Tanaka and Sir Michael Weston, who have just been accredited to the Conference and are among us for the first time today. I would like to assure them of the cooperation of my delegation in all the Conference's work, and to wish them every success in their new functions. I would also like to cordially welcome Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, who is taking part in our debate today for the first time. I am sure that the Conference will listen to his statement with special attention. On behalf of the Conference, and on behalf of my delegation as well, I would also like to extend to him our best wishes for success in his important post.

On the list of speakers, apart from the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, are the representatives of Turkey, Belgium, Kenya and Japan, as well as the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. Mr. Dahlman will be introducing the sixth report on the Group of Scientific Experts' second technical test (GSETT-2) and the Ad Hoc Group's progress report, which have been distributed as documents CD/1144 and CD/1145. I now give the floor to the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky.

Mr. PETROVSKY (United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs): Mr. President, may I, at the outset, thank you for the kind words of welcome that you have extended to me and for your wishes concerning the responsibilities facing me?

It is indeed an honour and a pleasure for me to address this Conference. On the one hand, I am representing the Secretary-General of the United Nations and would like to convey his personal and warm greetings to all of you. On the other hand, I am also attending this meeting for the first time in my new capacity as Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, responsible for political and security issues, including disarmament. However, this august hall and the Conference on Disarmament are not new to me. I feel that I am among friends of long standing. There are many present with whom I have developed a close relationship in the past and I am looking forward to making new friends as we work together to meet the new challenges and extraordinary opportunities which now exist in international relations.

(Mr. Petrovsky, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs)

Within a short span of time the contours of international security have radically changed. The end of the cold war and the start of major arms reductions have placed disarmament in a totally different perspective. Rather than being aimed primarily at maintaining a balance of power between two military alliances, arms control and disarmament are now increasingly recognized also as constituents of an international security agenda in which issues should be addressed through preventive diplomacy, peace-making and peace-keeping.

Amidst these changes, we need to ask ourselves some basic questions about the future of disarmament. What are the principal challenges? What should be our priorities? How should we best direct our efforts to achieve solid success in this very important field of international cooperation? I should like to offer some preliminary thoughts on these vital questions and on the implications for the ways in which disarmament diplomacy will be conducted in the future.

Long-established agenda items still remain and need to be pursued with energy and pragmatism, but at the same time we must not allow ourselves to remain prisoners of the past. The challenge of change is upon us and it is my deep belief that we should respond by looking again at the whole conceptual basis of the disarmament process.

The threat of conflict among the major Powers has declined dramatically, practically to the point of non-existence. Nuclear and conventional stockpiles are also in decline; and the pace of weapons modernization, especially in the area of nuclear armaments, seems to have diminished significantly. Our old preoccupations with the offensive character of nuclear force postures have now given way to growing concerns over the safe handling, storage, and disposal of weapons.

These developments, however, do not render the pursuit of disarmament irrelevant or obsolete. On the contrary, as this new era unfolds, the world is still beset with tensions, violence and the burden of overarmament. We are in particular witnessing a major upsurge in ethnic and intra-State tensions, often leading to violence on a distressingly large scale. This trend is an unmistakably worldwide phenomenon and one that poses a severe challenge to traditional methods of conflict resolution.

Fortunately, as the bilateral era has passed, the impulse for multilateral action to deal with emerging threats to peace and security has markedly increased. We can discern a new assertiveness within the intergovernmental bodies of the United Nations as well as outside the organization, along with a deepened involvement in the responsibilities of the Secretariat, ranging from conflict mediation and peace-keeping to monitoring, inspection and weapons disposal as part of activities duly authorized by the Security Council.

(Mr. Petrovsky, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs)

I also believe that we have arrived at the stage where the processes and techniques of arms regulation and disarmament need no longer be viewed only in the realm of theory. Instead, they are matters for practical action. The implementation of the multifaceted techniques of information exchange, observation, inspection, monitoring and weapons disposal is proving to be a very healthy experience these days. Sometimes, problems thought to exist during negotiations are found to have simple solutions in the field, while the practical application itself sometimes reveals situations - and solutions - previously unimagined at the negotiating table. The consistent common denominator, however, is the development of confidence and mutual trust born from interaction between human beings. I might add, as a personal aside, that from this I infer that we should not try to negotiate minutely for every possible contingency: there comes a stage when a certain risk has to be taken. If the spirit is right, human common sense will find the solution in the field.

It is one thing to identify the roles and contributions of disarmament, but quite another to gain agreement on an agenda that is balanced and relevant to real security needs. All of us face major challenges ahead, both in deciding on the direction of future multilateral negotiations and in completing work on major outstanding items. Rather than address the specific items on your agenda, I should like to comment briefly on several general areas where innovative thinking and concerted diplomatic effort are urgently needed.

The first area concerns the continuing spread - in all its aspects - of the tools and technologies of mass destruction and their delivery systems. Without question, this issue has moved today to the forefront of international concerns. In the wake of the Persian Gulf war, there is a heightened sensitivity to weapons proliferation and the potential for the spread of advanced weapons capability to ignite the embers of regional conflict. In its 31 January meeting at the level of heads of State and government, the Security Council spoke to this point by declaring that the proliferation of all weapons of mass destruction constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and by committing itself to take appropriate action to prevent the spread of such weapons. The question is how to translate such sentiments into concrete practical action.

By its very nature, the problem of proliferation defies simple solutions. Clearly, one element of sound policy must be responsible behaviour by States to control sources of supply without, however, curbing transfers of technology for peaceful purposes to developing countries. Another element must be the active exercise of self-restraint on the part of prospective recipients. Yet the non-proliferation effort does not end there. Further substantive progress on nuclear disarmament, both quantitative and qualitative, is also necessary. It is imperative that the significant reductions in nuclear arms agreed to so far be translated into actions at an

(Mr. Petrovsky, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs)

early date and not be sidetracked by the course of political events. At the same time, the possibility of illegal transfers of weapons earmarked for elimination presents new potential for proliferation, as does the possibility of scientists and other technical personnel taking up employment elsewhere. Those issues must be addressed urgently and effectively.

Chemical and biological disarmament are also vital components of our global efforts. I need not dwell on the particulars or the unique importance of the chemical weapons convention. I echo the sentiments of the Secretary-General in expressing my fervent hope that you will face the challenges and successfully overcome the remaining obstacles during this session. For this Conference not to find agreement on an issue of such significance would be a major setback to the progress in international security achieved in the past few years. You have overcome too many obstacles in this long race to fail now.

A second area that demands new and creative thinking concerns conventional weaponry - a topic that for too long has been the orphan of our disarmament efforts. In certain respects, the global situation is not an auspicious one: the world is awash in surplus conventional arms and equipment as a result of disarmament measures in the demise of the cold war; meanwhile, high-technology weapons are in great demand in the aftermath of the Gulf war; and excessive production capacity in parts of the industrialized world is triggering an unseemly scramble for new markets.

Managing these trends will not be easy. Arms production and international transfers are core security concerns for many States - suppliers as well as recipients - and efforts to delineate between responsible and destabilizing arms transfers are bound to bring highly subjective judgements into play. Moreover, differing perspectives on the rights of self-defence versus the excessive accumulation of arms further complicate this issue. And yet, let us not surrender to undue pessimism. Cooperation on conventional arms restraint is both sensible and - more importantly - quite practicable.

There is, of course, the path of greater transparency. During the cold war, this confidence-building aspect was often dismissed as being inconsequential or, at best, a pale substitute for real reductions in arms. With hindsight, however, the intrinsic benefits of greater openness and transparency are more apparent to all. Steps toward transparency can help to dispel suspicions that are unfounded or based on worst-case threat perceptions. It is also logical that transparency should breed greater self-restraint, for in a situation of greater openness, threatening behaviour becomes harder to hide. I see openness and transparency as playing a much more important early-warning role for our collective security, which is emergent today and is becoming the most important part of a new world system, which is for me a "pax United Nations".

(Mr. Petrovsky, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs)

We at the United Nations are working diligently with governmental experts to develop procedures for the operation of the newly established Register of Conventional Arms. We are convinced that the Register, with further elaboration and adjustment, can help to foster a climate of voluntary restraint and provide a better basis for informed debate on ways and means to control conventional arms.

In this regard, I would also like to stress the importance we attach to the General Assembly's requests to this Conference to address the interrelated aspects of excessive and destabilizing accumulations of arms. Equally important are issues relating to the transfer of dual-use high technology and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. While the conceptual issues here are daunting, adopting measures designed to promote greater openness and transparency in these areas, in accordance with the existing legal instruments, would strengthen multilateral cooperation and promote greater predictability.

Another promising approach is that of regionally based limitations on conventional arms, such as those exemplified in the 1989 Esquipulas II accords among Central American States and the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. While the experience of one region is not necessarily applicable elsewhere, in the field of conventional weapons as in other security fields regional solutions to regional problems should be strongly promoted.

Ultimately, there cannot be truly effective conventional disarmament without an extensive redirection of defence industry capacity in many parts of the world. Many countries are in the throes of such a transition - it is a painful, disruptive process but one that is necessary for longer-term social well-being. While conversion is fundamentally a domestic matter, it has far-reaching international consequences. The economic and social problems are not easily nor quickly resolved, and in general, it seems to me, in the future agenda more attention should be paid to the complex of immediate post-disarmament measures, measures which we are supposed to undertake immediately as disarmament has become a fact of life. Thus, the international community should look closely at what it might do to play a greater supporting role.

A third area which concerns me greatly in my present capacity is the evolving relationship between States and international secretariats in the post-cold-war era. Anyone who looks at the United Nations today cannot fail to notice the substantial increase in the type of missions that international staff are being called upon to perform - be it in mediation, peace-keeping, weapons inspections, transitional assistance, election monitoring, or humanitarian relief, just to name a few.

The disarmament field is not immune to this trend. The new Secretary-General is keenly aware of the Secretariat's existing disarmament-related responsibilities, including fact-finding investigations into allegations of chemical weapons use and also in the enforcement area,

(Mr. Petrovsky, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs)

as in the implementation of Security Council resolution 687 and subsequent resolutions. We are also watching closely ongoing developments, here and elsewhere, that could result in new institutional elaborations. The Secretariat has amply demonstrated its readiness to take on new tasks but to do so effectively we need to have mandates that are clear and achievable, and that bear some rational relation to the willingness of States to fund new or continuing missions. It is sadly ironic that multilateralism has re-entered the mainstream of disarmament activity at precisely a time of great financial uncertainty for the United Nations system as a whole.

Our respective interests suggest, above all, the need for candid ongoing dialogue. It is up to States, of course, to decide where and when they need assistance. We in the Secretariat wish to be a source of ideas and advice, where appropriate, and an active partner - I would like to stress, a partner - of States in promoting new approaches to disarmament and arms control and encouraging their consideration by Member States.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, it has been an honour and a pleasure to be present with you today. I wish to congratulate Mr. Vicente Berasategui on his recent appointment as Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General to the Conference. For my own part, I can assure you that the Office for Disarmament Affairs, under its Director, Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, will continue to promote disarmament with all the energy and professionalism that its resources permit. Personally, I shall follow the work of this Conference, as did my distinguished predecessor Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi, with great interest. I also look forward to fruitful contacts in the future, and I count on very close cooperation with this important body headed by you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank you, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, for your statement and the kind words you addressed to the Chair. I am sure that the statement made by Mr. Petrovsky just now to the Conference on Disarmament, particularly in this phase of international relations relating to disarmament, will not fail to stimulate new initiatives and prompt greater cooperation among all countries to promote true disarmament. I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey, Mr. Arar.

Mr. ARAR (Turkey) (translated from French): Mr. President, allow me to begin my statement by expressing my delegation's satisfaction at the way in which you have guided the work of this body, as President of the Conference on Disarmament and Permanent Representative of Algeria, a country with which Turkey shares a common heritage and enjoys a friendship that is several centuries old.

(Mr. Arar, Turkey)

At its 66th plenary meeting, held on 9 December 1991, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a decision entitled "Transparency in armaments". Through this decision the General Assembly invited the Conference on Disarmament to elaborate universal practical means to enhance openness and transparency in the acquisition of conventional weapons as well as in the transfer of high technology for military purposes. The Conference on Disarmament was also invited by the General Assembly to insert the results of its work in this area in its annual report.

Turkey has always supported the concept of transparency in the military sphere. We consider that it is in itself a measure for building confidence that will reduce suspicions among States both regionally and internationally. Indeed, that is why my country supported the establishment in the United Nations of a standardized system of annual reporting on military budgets. It is also for that reason that Turkey co-sponsored the draft decision on transparency in armaments and, in order to bring about effectiveness and equality in the application of this decision, has spared no effort to ensure that its scope will be broadened to apply also to production. My delegation is of the opinion that the Conference on Disarmament is the best forum to undertake the work which will contribute to making this decision universally applicable. We think that its experience makes it well placed to establish the necessary machinery to attain this end. In our opinion, in order to respond to the General Assembly's invitation the Conference must, first of all, include this item in its agenda and then set up an ad hoc committee on the issue. The establishment of a work programme and a timetable for this programme will be vital for the achievement of this purpose.

"Transparency in armaments" carries with it an idea of universality. It is a question that is of interest to all countries. Consequently, the ad hoc committee to be established for this purpose must of course proceed on the basis of an open-ended system of participation, that is to say open to all members and non-members of the Conference. My delegation considers that the ad hoc committee should not waste much time on procedural issues but start assessing measures that will bring about universal openness and transparency concerning arms proliferation, production and transfers. It will be essential for international machinery to monitor means of acquisition of weapons, including national production, to be devised in the ad hoc committee.

As a relatively new member of an observer delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, I must confess that I am somewhat surprised at the frequency with which reference is made to the "credibility" of this Conference. All too often I hear speakers say that the conclusion of the convention on chemical weapons will enhance the credibility of the Conference. That the rise in the number of observer countries - which in fact exceeds that of member countries - testifies to their interest in the work undertaken in this forum and enhances its credibility. I hear it said that the participation of eminent persons in these meetings contributes to its credibility. None of this is incorrect. Yet my delegation thinks that the true credibility of this body will be judged by the crowning of its efforts, and even more so by the

(Mr. Arar, Turkey)

quality of its work, the way and approach it follows to deal with the issues, its capacity to reformulate its agenda and restructure its membership in keeping with the new requirements that have appeared following the rapid evolution that our world has recently undergone. From this point of view too, "transparency in armaments" provides an opportunity that must be grasped as this issue deserves.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Turkey for his statement and the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I also thank him for his reference to the historical links between his country and mine. I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium, Ambassador Servais.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (translated from French): First of all, I would like to associate myself with the words of welcome you addressed to our colleagues from Japan and Great Britain, Ambassadors Tanaka and Weston. I wish them a happy stay among us and every success in their mission in Geneva. I would also like, on behalf of my delegation and the Western Group, to convey greetings to the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Ambassador Vladimir Petrovsky, and to thank him sincerely for the important message he has communicated to us this morning. Now, with your permission, Mr. President, I will continue in English.

(continued in English)

The following statement is made on behalf of my own delegation and the delegations of Australia, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States have taken note of the declaration of the representatives of the peoples of the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Montenegro, of 27 April 1992, which states that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues "the State, international legal and political personality of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia". This declaration raises questions related to the continuity of Yugoslavia's membership of international organizations and conferences, including the Conference on Disarmament, which are under consideration. As a matter of fact, Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States have not accepted the automatic continuity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in international organizations and conferences, including the Conference on Disarmament.

At this stage they reserve their position on this question and consider that the participation in the Conference on Disarmament of the delegation in question is without prejudice to future decisions which might be taken on this and related issues.

Mr. OGADA (Kenya): Mr. President, allow me to commend you for the manner in which you have been guiding our work during your presidency. I would also like to thank Ambassador Mutuale Kikanke of Zaire for having presided over the Conference effectively and efficiently during his tenure of office. My delegation, like many others, is happy to see Ambassador Vicente Berasategui as the new Secretary-General of the Conference, and believe that his vast experience and diplomatic skills may greatly contribute to the smooth functioning of this Conference. My delegation also would like to welcome the new Ambassadors to the Conference, including the most recently arrived Ambassadors of Japan and the United Kingdom, that is, Ambassador Yoshitomo Tanaka and Sir Michael Weston respectively. We look forward to working with them.

This morning the Conference is graced with the presence of Ambassador Vladimir Petrovsky, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs in the United Nations in New York. We have listened with great attention to his statement.

Upon instructions from my Government I would like to state that the Kenya delegation would like to join all those delegations that support the appropriately named Australian initiative that was formally presented to the Conference by Senator Gareth Evans, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, during the plenary meeting of the Conference held on Thursday, 19 March 1992 when the Senator presented the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons prepared by the Australian Government. This initiative once again underlines the commitment of the Australian Government in efforts to ban chemical weapons.

My delegation would like to commend the Australian Government for having single-handedly undertaken the monumental task of preparing a draft convention prohibiting chemical weapons which will undoubtedly enrich and accelerate the multilateral negotiations currently in progress in the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

One of the stated objectives of the Australian initiative is to enable the Conference to conclude a convention prohibiting chemical weapons by 1992 as reflected in the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. My delegation, like all other delegations in the Conference, is bound by this limitation in which to conclude the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention which have been going on for a long time.

While the urgency to conclude the negotiations this year underlines the need to speed up the pace of negotiations, my delegation would like to state that speed should be coupled with caution to avoid stalling in the negotiations, as some of the remaining issues require clear and well-considered solutions. Some of the remaining problems which require careful attention are for example on routine verification of the chemical industry, challenge inspections, article XI on economic and technological development, the executive council and old and abandoned chemical weapons.

(Mr. Ogada, Kenya)

Over the many years of negotiations we have come to be well aware of the positions of many delegations on the remaining issues. This year should not be the year in which to repeat positions which cannot contribute to compromise solutions. All delegations should work for a convention that protects the interests of all developed and developing countries, be they small, medium or large.

The Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Adolf Ritter von Wagner, has a difficult task in guiding the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention towards the desired conclusion. He has appointed a committed and experienced team to assist him in his work, and my delegation supports all his endeavours, as well as those of the Chairman on the Working Group on Verification and the Friends of the Chair on the various issues under negotiation.

In conclusion I would like to thank the Australian Government for having presented this timely initiative which is an important contribution to the negotiations to achieve a convention banning chemical weapons, and I would also like to thank Ambassador Paul O'Sullivan for having personally visited Nairobi to discuss the Australian initiative with officials of the Kenya Government who assured him of the Government's support for this initiative which is compatible with Kenya's commitment to participate in all efforts to eliminate weapons of mass destruction and specifically chemical weapons.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Kenya for his statement and the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Japan, Ambassador Tanaka.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): Mr. President, I have asked the floor firstly to thank you and other distinguished Ambassadors for their most cordial words in welcoming me. I am aware that my predecessor, Ambassador Donowaki, has made a great contribution to the Conference on Disarmament, especially as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. As a newcomer, I simply would like to express my wish to spare no efforts to make some contributions to the CD bearing in mind the critical juncture of CWC negotiation this year. I am also very aware that in this endeavour I shall have to depend on the guidance and cooperation of you, Mr. President, and other colleagues.

Furthermore, I would like to join previous speakers to express my appreciation of the presence today of His Excellency Ambassador Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations, and I would like to thank him for his very important statement.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to make a brief statement concerning the question of continuity of Yugoslavia's membership in this forum. The Yugoslavian situation is still in flux and the question of its membership arises not only in this forum but in other international organizations. At this stage, my delegation would like to reserve its position on this question.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Japan for his statement and the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I will now give the floor to Mr. Ola Dahlman, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, who is to introduce the sixth report on the Group of Scientific Experts' second technical test (GSETT-2) and the progress report on the Group's thirty-third session, issued as documents CD/1144 and CD/1145 respectively.

Mr. DAHLMAN (Sweden): I regret that this report on the meeting of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts earlier this spring is coming this late. I am however pleased to report today on the session by the Ad Hoc Group held from 2 to 13 March 1992 and attended by experts and representatives from 25 countries and to introduce documents CD/1144 containing the Group's sixth main report and CD/1145 containing the Group's progress report.

I have on earlier occasions reported to the Conference on the results of the Group's second large-scale technical test, usually referred to as GSETT-2, and I will today only briefly summarize the results presented in CD/1144. During the Group's next session a number of appendices to this report will be compiled, containing detailed technical and scientific material.

The development of any advanced technical system is a dynamic process, in which proposed technical concepts are tested in practical experiments and the system design is modified according to the experience thus gained. The Ad Hoc Group has since its very beginning followed this principle in its development of a global seismological verification system.

The first global system was designed in 1978 (CCD/558), and was based on the exchange of pre-analysed "level I" data only. This system, which provided for the exchange of only limited amounts of data, was tested in the Group's first large-scale experiment, which we usually refer to as GSETT-1, in 1984 (CD/720).

Based on the experiences of that test and utilizing the rapid scientific and techological development, inter alia in information technology, the Ad Hoc Group effected a comprehensive redesign of the system. The modernized system, presented in 1989 (CD/903), was a system based on the exchange of wave-form data on all detected signals - "level II data" - and the routine analysis of this large data volume at international data centres.

The purpose of the recent test of GSETT-2 was to test the methods and procedures developed by the Group, going beyond what is routinely used for scientific purposes. The test was carried out in four phases: a first phase where experimental facilities and procedures were established around the world; a second phase where a number of short-term preparatory tests were conducted. The third phase was the full-scale test where the entire experimental system was operated continuously for 49 consecutive days from

(Mr. Dahlman, Sweden)

late April to early June 1991. Thirty-four countries participated in this main phase providing data from in all 60 seismological stations located in all continents. The individual countries and their national data centres were linked by modern means of communication to one or more of the four experimental international data centres operated in Canberra, Moscow, Stockholm and Washington, D.C.

The fourth phase, the evaluation of the test, is still continuing. Report CD/1144 summarizes the technical and operational results gained so far. In addition, a unique seismological database has been compiled during the test, which will be of interest to the wider seismological scientific community. Thanks to efforts by the United States delegation all data collected during GSETT-2 are now easily and generally available on two CD discs. This in itself is an illustration of the dramatic technological development, where data volumes which could barely be handled by the most advanced computers of yesterday can today be stored on CD discs and be analysed on personal computers available to all of us. This also illustrates the need to continuously update and modernize the global seismological system. In a broader perspective it stresses the need that modern technology be fully utilized also in support of arms limitation and disarmament efforts.

The GSETT-2 has provided the Group with most valuable results and experiences which will form a basis for reassessing the design of the system proposed in 1989 (CD/903). Such a reassessment, which will take into account also recent scientific, technological and other developments, will be reported on during the spring session of 1993.

Now that the main phase of GSETT-2 is successfully completed I would like to pay tribute in particular to some of my collaborators. Mr. Peter Basham of Canada has made a most valuable contribution as Coordinator of the Test. Dr. Frode Ringdal, Norway, the Groups Scientific Secretary, has as always successfully carried the responsibility of compiling our reports. The Group Secretary, Mr. Cassandra, and the secretariat here in Geneva have done excellent work not only in supporting the Group during its session but also in the preparation and translation of the report. The Group noted with appreciation the convening of an informal technical workshop by the United States in Dallas, Texas, from 3 to 5 December 1991, to assist in the evaluation of the results of GSETT-2. The Australian delegation has recently hosted a workshop in Canberra to evaluate the seismological method used at experimental international data centres.

The Ad Hoc Group continued its discussions on future work remaining under its current mandate. As I have just mentioned the next step in the dynamic process of developing the system is to analyse the implications for the present system design of the results obtained in GSETT-2 and of recent scientific, technological and other developments. This reassessment of the existing system design is likely to highlight certain issues and the Group tentatively identified a number that deserve careful attention in the Group's future work. I will comment briefly on some of these issues.

(Mr. Dahlman, Sweden)

The seismological station, the sensor, is the most critical component of a global seismological verification system. The technical quality of the stations, their proper siting at locations with good receiving conditions and an appropriate global distribution of the stations are fundamental to obtain a capable system. The Ad Hoc Group considers that the further development and testing of a standardized seismological station, usually referred to as a CD station, to be used worldwide, is an important future task. An interesting option in this context is the possibility of introducing the "open station" concept by which data are made easily available by remotely accessing the computer systems of the individual stations. The selection of sites for seismological stations all over the globe and the deployment of experimental stations to conduct test recordings would provide information of great importance for the design of a global system. Studies of alternative global networks and estimates of their expected capabilities would be another important task. Such studies should include also estimates of operating and investment costs.

The present concept of a global system includes four experimental international data centres, and four such experimental centres have also been utilized in the two main tests. Recent developments have made it interesting, however, to study the feasibility of reducing the number of international data centres and maybe go as far as having only one.

The Ad Hoc Group regards continued testing on a bilateral and multilateral basis with the widest possible global participation as an essential element also in its future work. The Ad Hoc Group plans to continue the discussion of its future work, including the incorporation of new technologies, at its next session.

The Ad Hoc Group suggests that its next session, subject to approval by the Conference on Disarmament, should be convened from 27 July to 7 August 1992.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank Mr. Ola Dahlman, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, for introducing the reports issued as CD/1144 and CD/1145. Following the customary practice, I will submit to the Conference for adoption at the plenary meeting scheduled for Thursday 21 May the recommendation appearing in paragraph 11 of the progress report. The recommendation set out in paragraph 11 relates to the date of the Ad Hoc Group's next session, which, as Mr. Ola Dahlman has just announced, is to be held between 27 July and 7 August 1992. The Conference will also take note of the sixth report on the Group of Scientific Experts' second technical test (GSETT-2), contained in document CD/1144.

At this point in our work I now give the floor to Ambassador Batsanov, the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, I would like to express my satisfaction at the way you are leading us in our work and congratulate our new colleagues, Ambassador Tanaka from Japan and Sir Michael Weston from the United Kingdom. I would like to make a very brief comment and a short observation in connection with the statement made by Mr. Petrovsky, the Under-Secretary-General, not just to note, so to speak, the importance of what he said, but also to express one thought on it.

Geneva contains a concentration, an accumulation, of what one might call significant disarmament expertise on the part of States, and thus it is a fine thing that the leadership of the United Nations Secretariat finds it possible to inform us of its ideas and, I hope, also become acquainted with the thinking of Government representatives entrusted with disarmament negotiations. I think this is particularly important in a situation where the United Nations apparatus is being reformed in order to bring it up to date and adapt it, so to speak, to new conditions and the move to a new level of work. Naturally, I speak on behalf of the Russian delegation, but I think others too will be interested in the development of a new partnership with the part of the United Nations Secretariat which deals with disarmament issues, in order for the partnership to be mutually beneficial and to help solve the basic questions facing us in the field of disarmament. It is on a note of hope, so to speak, for the development of such a partnership that I would like to conclude.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Batsanov, the representative of the Russian Federation, for his statement and the suggestions prompted by the remarks of the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky. The representative of Yugoslavia has asked to speak at this stage in our work. I give him the floor.

Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia): I would also like to welcome most warmly the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Petrovsky, a friend of many of us, and to note his important statement and his eagerness to help our Conference. I would also like to welcome our new colleagues from the United Kingdom and Japan, wishing them all the best and success in their mission.

I am certain, Mr. President, that you will agree with me that this is not the right place nor the right time to discuss the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. However, in connection with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Belgium, Ambassador Servais, on behalf of some members of the Western Group, and the distinguished representative of Japan, Ambassador Tanaka, it is my duty to make the following brief statement.

The Federal Assembly of Yugoslavia, at its session held on 27 April 1992, promulgated the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Under this Constitution, strictly respecting the continuity of the international

(Mr. Calovski, Yugoslavia)

personality of Yugoslavia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will continue to fulfil all the rights conferred on, and obligations assumed by, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in international relations, including its membership in all international organizations and its participation in international treaties ratified or acceded to by Yugoslavia.

So I would like to assure you, Mr. President, that Yugoslavia will continue without prejudice or reservations its very active profile in the CD, and will endeavour to make a constructive and positive contribution, as it has been doing so far.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Calovski, the representative of Yugoslavia, for his statement. I would now like to take up other matters on our agenda. Today the secretariat has distributed a draft decision relating to the request for participation in our work submitted by the Philippines, Mauritius and the United Republic of Tanzania. The draft decision is contained in document CD/WP.426, containing a note from the President. No objections were raised when the communications from the Philippines, Mauritius and the United Republic of Tanzania were distributed. I therefore suggest that we adopt the draft decision directly in plenary. May I consider that the Conference adopts document CD/WP.426? I see no objections.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Today we were supposed to hold an informal meeting on the substance of item 3 of the agenda, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters". However, since the members of the Conference have accepted the kind invitation extended by the Government of Austria to consider the proposal that Vienna should be the seat of the future organization for the prohibition of chemical weapons, I feel it appropriate to postpone our work on this agenda item to Thursday, 21 May. I see no objections.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The secretariat has also distributed today the timetable of meetings of the Conference and its subsidiary bodies scheduled for next week. The timetable was drawn up in consultation with the chairmen of the subsidiary bodies, and as usual it is purely indicative and can be changed as necessary. I would like to emphasize that in accordance with this timetable, immediately after the plenary meeting on Thursday, 21 May, the Conference will hold the informal meeting on item 3, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters". On that understanding I propose that we adopt this informal paper. I see no objections; the paper is adopted.

(The President)

There are no other questions to take up today, but before I adjourn the meeting I would like to inform you that at our next plenary the first speaker will be the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, His Excellency Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 21 May at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.